**Readings for Civil Society Workshop**

*Also available at http://inventing-futures.org/inventing-futures/ideas-and-stuff/*

***From*: Henry Veltmeyer, H. 2008. ‘Civil Society and Local Development’ INTERAÇÕES, Campo Grande, v. 9, n. 2, p. 229-243, jul./dez. 2008.**

Recourse to the notion of civil society, and the construction of a civil society discourse, take different forms. In fact there are three different traditions in the use of the term, each associated with a particular conception of civil society (in regard to which organisations are included and excluded), a particular analytical use and a particular ideology.

One of these traditions can be labelled liberal, associated with a mainstream form of political science and economics in which the spheres of politics and economics are treated as analytically distinct systems, is fundamentally concerned with and focuses on what we might term ‘political development’– establishing a participatory form of politics and ‘good ‘ i.e. ‘democratic’ governance. Here civil society is conceived of in essentially political terms, rooted in the Anglo-American tradition of liberal-democratic theory that identifies civic institutions and political activity as an essential component of political society based on the principles of citizenship, rights, democratic representation and the rule of law. On the ideological spectrum (left, centre, right) liberals see civil society as a countervailing force against an unresponsive, corrupt state and exploitative corporations that disregard environmental issues and human rights abuses (KAMAT, 2003).

The second tradition, rooted in a more sociological view of the state-society relation and the ideas of Antonio Gramsci, is similarly concerned with the form of politics but sees civil society as a repository of diverse forms of popular resistance to government policies, and the basis of a ‘counter-hegemonic’ bloc of social forces engaged in a process of contesting state and other forms of class power. It is based on what might be termed a radical ideology–a shared belief in the need for radical change, civil society is seen as a repository of the forces of resistance and opposition, forces than can be mobilized into a counter-hegemonic bloc (MORTON, 2004).

The third tradition is associated with the project of international cooperation for development; In this tradition civil society is viewed as an array of social organisations representing ‘stakeholders’ in a process of economic development, a strategic partner in the war against global poverty waged by the World Bank and other international development associations and agencies. In this context, civil society is viewed as na agency for bringing about a participatory and empowering form of development–na organisational means of transforming the new development paradigm into practice. Proponents of this conception of civil society generally share a liberal ideology in terms seeing in civil society the beneficial effects of globalization for the development of democracy and economic progress (CHAN, 2001). Conservatives in this context tend to view NGOs as ‘false saviours of international development’ (KAMAT, 2003).

***From*: Banks, N and Hulme, D. 2012’ The role of NGOs and civil society in development and poverty reduction’ BWPI Working paper 171, p21**

While ‘strengthening civil society’ became a specific policy objective for donors in the 1990s shift towards good governance, progress has been limited because of their simplistic view of civil society as a collection of organisations rather than a space for interaction and negotiation around power. The real power of civil society lies in the context and space in which organisations are formed and interactions take place, rather than the organisations and activities themselves (Lewis and Kanji 2009). This is not reflected in the development community’s tendency to view the rise of NGOs as an indication of the strengthening of civil society, with donors treating and funding NGOs as a democratising element of civil society (White 1999; Fowler 2000). While NGOs comprise part of civil society, they are far from synonymous with civil society, and do not automatically strengthen civil society, given the pressures they face to respond less to community needs than to those of donors (Hudock 1999) and that they are unable to engage in highly politicised debates and arenas. There is some debate as to whether NGOs are an externally-driven phenomenon threatening the development of indigenous civil society and grassroots activism by distracting attention and funding from more politicised organisations (Clark 1998; Stiles 2002; Bano 2008; Bebbington et al 2008; Chhotray 2008; Racelis 2008). At worst, given their incentives to operate as non-political institutions, NGO involvement can bring an end to citizen-driven movements, losing the transformative power of radical ideas and threatening the sustainability of long-term processes seeking structural change (Bebbington 1997; White 1999; Kaldor 2003; Townsend et al 2004; Bebbington et al 2008; Lewis and Kanji 2009; Elbers and Arts 2011).

***From*: The Future Role of Civil Society. 2013. The World Economic Forum**

**Civil society is evolving in impactful and dynamic ways.**

Definitions are changing as civil society is recognized as encompassing far more than a mere “sector” dominated by the NGO community: civil society today includes an ever wider and more vibrant range of organized and unorganized groups, as new civil society actors blur the boundaries between sectors and experiment with new organizational forms, both online and off.

Roles are also changing: civil society actors are demonstrating their value as facilitators, conveners and innovators as well as service providers and advocates, while the private sector is playing an increasingly visible and effective role in tackling societal challenges. Renewed interest in the role of faith is identifying powerful sources of social capital.

Furthermore, the context for civil society is changing: economic and geopolitical power is shifting away from Europe and North America; technology is disrupting traditional funding models and dramatically shifting social engagement; and political pressures are restricting the space for civil society activities in many countries. All of these shifts pose challenges, create opportunities and require rapid adaptation on the part of traditional actors.

Underpinning all of this is the sense that civil society in 2013 is a vibrant, diverse and evolving space, which is increasingly innovative in its attempts to solve societal challenges and support local, national and global governance.

Looking forward to 2030, civil society leaders need to understand how shifting external contexts will shape their opportunities to achieve impact, and, in particular, what this evolution means for their relationships with businesses, governments and international organizations. In a turbulent and uncertain environment, actors can no longer work well in isolation – new, more effective ways of tackling societal challenges will inevitably transcend traditional sector boundaries. This means civil society actors need to look to unusual sources for inspiration and relevance in order to adapt successfully.

By being engaged with government, business and international organizations, civil society actors can and should provide the resilient dynamism the world urgently needs. The power and influence of civil society are growing and should be harnessed to create trust and enable action across sectors.

The changes that civil society is undergoing strongly suggest that it should no longer be viewed as a “third sector”; rather, civil society should be the glue that binds public and private activity together in such a way as to strengthen the common good.

In playing this role, civil society actors need to ensure they retain their core missions, integrity, purposefulness and high levels of trust. The world will always need independent organizations and individuals to act as watchdogs, ethical guardians and advocates of the marginalized or under-represented. Civil society in all its forms has an important role in holding all stakeholders, including itself, to the highest levels of accountability.

The shifting definitions, roles and contexts described in this report suggest that leaders across civil society, business, government and international organizations possess the opportunity to harness these shifts in order to design new solutions to societal challenges. Civil society can play a particularly powerful role in this process as an enabler and constructive challenger, creating the political and social space for collaborations that are based on the core values of trust, service and the collective good.

***From*: Mosse, David. 2004 *‘Is Good Policy Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice’.* Development and Change 35(4): 639–671**

P642.

Arguably, international development is characterized by a new managerialism, driven by two trends: on the one hand, a narrowing of the ends of development to quantified international development targets for the reduction of poverty, ill-health and illiteracy (OECD, 1996);3 but, on the other, a widening of its means. Whereas until the 1980s technology-led growth or the mechanisms of the market provided the instruments of development, today good government, a vibrant civil society and democracy are also pre-requisites of poverty reduction.4 In the extreme, nothing short of the managed reorganization of state and society is necessary to deliver on international development targets (and — since underdevelopment is now dangerous — to secure global security; Duffield 2001).5 As a ‘means’, social life is instrumentalized in new international public policy through policy-driven ideas such as social capital, civil society or good governance that theorize relationships between society, democracy and poverty reduction so as to extend the scope of rational design and social engineering from the technical and economic realm to the social and cultural (ibid.: 9). My point here is that if questions are to be raised about the relationship between policy and practice, design and outcome, in rational planning frameworks within the micro-world of the project, how much more important are such questions within the wider framework of contemporary international development

[. . .]

Understanding the relationship between policy discourse and field practices has been hampered by the dominance of two opposing views on development policy. These can be caricatured as follows. On the one hand there is an instrumental view of policy as rational problem solving — directly shaping the way in which development is done. On the other hand there is a critical view that sees policy as a rationalizing discourse concealing hidden purposes of bureaucratic power or dominance, in which the true political intent of devel- opment is hidden behind a cloak of rational planning (for example, Escobar, 1995; Ferguson, 1994; cf. Shore and Wright, 1997). Neither of these views does justice to the complexity of policy-making and its relationship to project practice, or to the creativity and skill involved in negotiating development.

[. . .]

Here I want to tell a development story that concerns a successful British aid funded participatory rural development project in India, the Indo-British Rainfed Farming project (IBRFP).14 Since I worked as a development con- sultant with this project over a period of more than twelve years, I am myself part of this story. The project, started in 1992 and implemented by a special unit of a national fertilizer manufacturing co-operative, the KBCL, worked in contiguous adivasi (Bhil tribal) districts of the western Indian states of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh. Its initial focus was on low cost, low subsidy inputs in natural resources development to improve the liveli- hoods of poor farming families (Jones et al., 1994). Based on participatory village-level planning, the project made interventions in soil and water con- servation, improved crop varieties, agro-forestry, joint forest management, horticulture, livestock, minor irrigation and credit management for input supply, and promoted village-based user and self-help groups.

[. . .]

 . . . we were acutely aware that, despite resistance from the project unit, development choices and implementation practices were profoundly shaped by the KBCL’s managerial regime and its organizational systems and procedures — budget categories, sanctioning time-frames, procedures for approval or targets. These prioritized familiar conventional programmes over innovations. As a result, routinized PRAs, CPAs (community problem analyses) and village workplans produced a strong convergence of activities into a fixed set: crop trials, SWC, tree-nurseries (etc.) rather than diverse programmes responsive to differentiated and localized needs. An oper- ational logic locked the project into certain design choices: for example, physical SWC works (earth ‘bunds’) met quantitative targets, disbursed development budgets, sustained farmer credit groups (through contribu- tions from wages), supported a cadre of village experts (jankars), repro- duced professional identities (among project engineers) and a hierarchy of staff posts at the level of the project office. The specializations of visiting consultants, KBCL budgeting, approval and accounting systems, and the complicity of villagers desiring subsidies and off-season wage labour bene- fits in the short term, all structured technical choices (for example, physical vs vegetative methods) — belying the consumer choice implied in PRA matrix ranking methods (Fiedrich, 2002).

***From*: Power. G. Maury, M & Maury, S. 2002 ‘*Operationalising bottom up learning in International NGOs.’* Development in Practice (12/3&4:272- 284)**

**What’s wrong with this picture?**

In 1995, a leading international NGO (INGO) fielded two community organisers in Harare, Zimbabwe, to live and work with residents of two different urban poor areas. In the ensuing months, the organisers unhurriedly tried to encourage ‘bottom-up’ development: understand the local situation, build on the local people’s material resources, creativity, knowledge, and views, strengthen local collective action, and facilitate a process in which the communities propose and pursue ideas that are organic to them. The workers did not put any funding into the communities for over a year. However, funds for the projects had been raised from private sources under the banner of community- based, sustainable development.

In 1996, the organisers were told by their regional programme manager that they were behind schedule in producing results. The programme director stressed that INGO performance criteria required that communities show progress on specific material improvements within one year. Further delays could result in a cut-off of funds, as donors might think the projects were going nowhere.

The organisers, hoping their bosses would come to understand the communities’ perspectives and adjust their expectations, resisted pressure from headquarters to spend money. They believed their work would be undermined if the communities realigned their activities to receive outside funds, rather than rallying around a shared vision of a preferred future relying primarily on their own resources. In the end, under pressure to spend the funds and in danger of losing their jobs, the organisers finally relented. The funding tap was turned on, and the INGO reported to donors in 1997 that the projects were reaching their targeted benchmarks.

***From*: Banks, N and Hulme, D. 2012’ The role of NGOs and civil society in development and poverty reduction’ BWPI Working paper 171, p8**

Two distinct roles for NGOs are highlighted, both as service providers and advocates for the poor. The service provider–advocate divide differentiates between the pursuit of ‘Big-D’ and ‘little-d’ development (Bebbington et al 2008; Hulme 2008). ‘Big-D’ development sees ‘Development’ as a project-based and intentional activity, in which tangible project outputs have little intention to make foundational changes that challenge society’s institutional arrangements. In contrast, ‘little-d’ ‘development’ regards development as an ongoing process, emphasising radical, systemic alternatives that seek different ways of organising the economy, social relationships and politics (Bebbington et al 2008). The shape of NGOs has changed over time. While many NGOs, particularly in Latin America, were created around the explicit intention of addressing structural issues of power and inequality and expanding civil society against hegemonic or weak and unrepresentative states, they have seen a shift in their organisational character and in the nature of their work, instead adopting technical and managerial solutions to social issues such as poverty through service delivery and welfare provision. Ninety percent of registered NGOs in Kenya, for example, are involved primarily in service delivery (Brass 2011). In the process, NGOs and their activities have become professionalised and depoliticised (Kamat 2004).

***From*: Long, N. 2002 ‘An Actor-oriented Approach to Development Intervention’*.* Background paper prepared for APO Meeting. Tokyo 22-26**

# Cornerstones of an actor-oriented analysis

It is helpful, before moving directly to a discussion of policy intervention issues, to provide a synopsis of the conceptual foundations of an actor-oriented analysis. The following statements capture the key elements:

* Social life is heterogeneous or polymorphic. That is, it comprises a wide diversity of social forms and cultural repertoires, even under seemingly homogeneous circumstances.
* It is necessary to study how such differences are produced, reproduced, consolidated and transformed and to identify the social processes involved, not merely the structural outcomes.
* Such a perspective requires a theory of agency based upon the capacity of actors to process their, and learn from others’, experiences and to act upon them. Agency implies a certain knowledgeability, whereby experiences and desires are reflexively accorded meanings and purposes, and the capability to command relevant skills, access resources of various kinds, and engage in particular organising practices.
* Social action is never an individual ego-centred pursuit. It takes place within networks of relations (involving human and non-human components), is shaped by both routine and explorative organising practices, and is bounded by certain social conventions, values and power relations.
* But it would be misleading to assume that such social and institutional constraints can be reduced to general sociological categories and hierarchies based on class, gender, status, ethnicity etc. Social action and interpretation is context specific and contextually generated. Boundary markers are specific to particular domains, arenas and fields of social action and should not be prejudged analytically.
* Meanings, values and interpretations are culturally constructed but they are differentially applied and reinterpreted in accordance with existing behavioural possibilities or changed circumstances, thereby generating ‘new’ cultural ´standards´.
* Related to these processes is the question of scale, by which I mean the ways in which ‘micro-scale’ interactional settings and localised arenas are connected to wider ‘macro-scale’ phenomena. Rather than seeing the ‘local’ as shaped by the ‘global’ or the ‘global’ as an aggregation of the ‘local’, an actor perspective aims to elucidate the precise sets of interlocking relationships, actor ‘projects’ and social practices that interpenetrate various social, symbolic and geographical spaces.
* In order to examine these interrelations it is useful to work with the concept of ‘social interface’ which explores how discrepancies of social interest, cultural interpretation, knowledge and power are mediated and perpetuated or transformed at critical points of linkage or confrontation. These interfaces need to be identified ethnographically, not presumed on the basis of predetermined categories.
* Thus the major challenge is to delineate the contours and contents of diverse social forms, explain their genesis and trace out their implications for strategic action and modes of consciousness. That is, we need to understand how these forms take shape under specific conditions and in relation to past configurations, and with a view to examining their viability, self-generating capacities and wider ramifications.

It is not the aim of actor-oriented analysis to formulate a generic theory of society or social change based on universal principles that govern how social orders are constituted and transformed. Instead it seeks to provide a conceptual and methodological framework for understanding the processes by which particular social forms or arrangements emerge and are consolidated or reworked in the everyday lives of people.

***From*: Request for Expressions of Interest for DEPP Innovations Labs project**

DEPP Innovation Programme

The Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP) works to develop effective humanitarian response where it is needed most. This ground breaking programme, one of the largest investments of its kind, is funded by UK Aid and managed collaboratively by the Communications with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) and Start Networks, leveraging the expertise of more than 50 member organisations.

The lab component of the DEPP is a two year programme to set up and manage an ecosystem of global and country labs that will identify and then support the development and scaling of promising areas of innovation in disaster preparedness. The labs will operate primarily from a ‘bottom up’ perspective – which is to say that they should identify areas of innovation which come directly from disaster affected communities and the organisations working closely with them and that the design process should be built around the end user.

This is an exciting opportunity to support locally driven change within the humanitarian system and to channel meaningful support and resources to the people most affected by disasters. The labs will deliver an experimental environment which embraces the risk of taking on and supporting new approaches to disaster preparedness.  They will provide the mechanism to support many new projects across several countries some of which will have the potential to scale and be used in other contexts and countries leading to system wide change.

The areas of innovation supported could include, for example, new models for organisations to collaborate with each other; new applications of information and communications and technology; use of new building materials and designs; new approaches for disaster affected communities to communicate with each other and to plan collaboratively; locally led early warning systems; application of new financing and insurance models; development of improved emergency response materials.

Up to four country labs will be established from within a pool of five countries; Jordan, Kenya, Bangladesh, Philippines and Mozambique. Each will be built around a field lab based in a vulnerable community to facilitate the user-centred design process. At all stages, the DEPP innovation labs will ensure that they are linking to, and not duplicating, other key innovation labs and initiatives in the humanitarian innovation ecosystem. Identification and start-up of the labs is planned to commence in early 2017.

A ‘global lab’ component of the programme, coordinated by the Start Network, will promote additional cross-sector partnerships with each of the labs and a global network of private sector, research, civil society and/or government organisations and create new opportunities for learning and collaboration and potential avenues to scale emerging areas of innovation.

A global research, monitoring, evaluation and learning team will support learning across the different levels of the programme and will seek to build an evidence base for the most effective ways to support innovation in the field of humanitarian preparedness.

This expression of interest is for interested hosts of the country Lab component of the programme.

#### **The Country Labs**

Working collaboratively with the global lab, each country lab will lead on designing a process to identify and support promising areas of innovation and the organisations (NGOs, businesses, collaborations, networks and entrepreneurs etc.) which are working on them.

#### Once identified, the labs will provide support to those identified emerging organisations to help them to overcome the barriers that slow down or prevent them from implementing and scaling up new approaches to emergency preparedness. They will help the projects to develop and refine sustainable business plans across the spectrum of charitable / for-profit / not-for-profit models as is appropriate for each project. The types of support which are expected to be required by projects include:

* Establishing mentoring relationships
* Leadership development
* Business skills development
* Provision of office space, communications facilities and administrative support
* Administration of a small grants fund to provide initial financial support
* Supporting the process of accessing larger amounts funding where appropriate

#### The labs will also facilitate the organisations that it supports to link together with each other, to learn from each other and to link up with a broader community of like-minded organisations which could include activities such as:

* Organising opportunities for organisations to present and critique each other’s business plans and strategies
* Organising and hosting networking events
* Facilitating exchange visits with organisations supported by the other DEPP labs or similar relevant organisations
* Linking up with the DEPP global labs partner organisations and network of advisors

Profile of Lab Hosts

This expression of interest is seeking organisations who are interested in operating labs in one or more of the countries listed above. Expressions of interest are encouraged from a broad range of organisations. Your organisation could be a charity, a not for profit / NGO, an academic institution or a private company or potentially another type of organisation,

We don’t expect all applicants to have experience of running humanitarian preparedness innovation labs because this is a new area of work. Some applicants may be very strong on humanitarian preparedness while others may be very experienced at running innovation labs. A consortium of organisations that brings humanitarian preparedness and innovation / lab experience would be viewed positively too.

It is very important to us that the organisations selected to run the labs have close connections with disaster affected communities and are committed to an approach based around the end users themselves.

Lab hosts could be national or international organisations (although we would expect the latter to work with national partners in the delivery of the lab) but we do strongly encourage national and locally based organisations to apply. We are seeking organisations that are committed to an approach based on collaboration and who want to be an active part of a community working internationally on innovation.

Expected Deliverables
The labs hosts role in the programme will be to deliver:

* An identified pipeline of projects focused on increasing levels of preparedness amongst disaster affected populations through the use of new approaches, technology, business or organisational models which have the potential to transform the sector through increased levels of localization, effectiveness and efficiency.
* An assessment of the support needs that these projects require to test and implement their ideas.
* The support infrastructure which is required, over a period of up to 18 months, to enable the organisations to grow, refine and scale their ideas either locally, nationally or in some cases internationally.
* The support required to enable the local community of entrepreneurs to build their own networks and to increase peer to peer collaboration.
* Increased leadership skills of the individuals involved in the projects; enabling them to be more effective ‘change agents’ within the sector.
* Participation in the monitoring, evaluation and learning processes of the programme (in collaboration with the global lab).
* Participation in key research issues (in collaboration with the global lab), particularly on issues related to how to best identify and support emerging areas of innovation to have a broader impact in the sector.

Clarifications

* The anticipated initial pipeline size for each lab could be in the region of 12 – 18 projects although this may vary from country to country.
* It is understood that not all projects supported by the labs will be scalable, sustainable or replicable by the time the lab closes. Labs will be encouraged to take on a broad range of projects initially, working collaboratively with them to develop at an appropriate speed and to quickly identify those with high potential for more focused support.
* Learning is a critical part of the programme, especially learning from the projects which fail to ultimately have a significant impact, so that the programme contributes to the emerging evidence base around the factors that contribute to a successful lab.
* Each lab will be encouraged to follow a locally appropriate, context driven approach to identification and support of projects, rather than to follow a centrally driven methodology.
* The labs are expected to be starting up by mid-2017 and run until the end of December 2018
* The global lab will facilitate access to a range of innovation expertise to support the labs
* It is understood that the lab hosts themselves will be ‘learning as they go’ and may have differing experience levels in the areas of innovation and humanitarian preparedness.

***From*: IFRC/Arup. 2011. ‘Key determinants of a successful CBDRR programme Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Study.**

Executive Summary

The International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC), as the ‘world’s largest humanitarian and development network’ is committed to building safety and resilience through its Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) programmes1 . As a movement the Red Cross-Red Crescent (RCRC) has significant knowledge and experience of implementing CBDRR programmes. However, defining the aims and objectives of such programmes and the critical factors that influence their impact remains a challenge. This is particularly acute when comparing outcomes and approaches between communities, countries and regions. CBDRR programmes were carried out in over 700 communities as part of the Tsunami Recovery Programme (TRP) alone. The IFRC has identified this as an opportunity to ‘identify and document lessons learned in implementing at scale CBDRR2 projects to strengthen community safety and resilience….also [to] use its large evidence base to research new ideas and contribute to the wider efforts in improving CBDRR work within the IFRC’ (IFRC, 2010: 2). This research report on the Key determinants of a successful CBDRR Programme has been prepared by Arup’s International Development team (Arup ID)3 on behalf of the IFRC as part of a wider CBDRR Study of the TRP. Specifically, this report draws on the experience of the TRP CBDRR programmes and current literature in order to identify ‘the key determinants of a successful CBDRR project; including identification of the most effective interventions and services (also in terms of sustainability) in the context of these key determinants’ (IFRC, 2010: 3). It is intended that the key determinants developed through this research will be used in the design, monitoring and evaluation of future programmes. A first step towards this is the lessons learned report which provides a further output from this study. Other outputs of the study include a “who, what, where” database of RCRC CBDRR projects; a research report identifying the characteristics of a safe and resilient community. Box 1: Additional research questions identified in the concept note (IFRC, 2010). ‘What minimum capacities are needed by NS’s at different levels (HQ and branch) to successfully manage and implement CBDRR?’ ‘To what degree does community ownership play a role in impact and sustainability and how can ownership be fostered and measured/monitored?’ ‘What are the necessary processes and components for effective RCRC movement coordination to ensure demand-driven CBDRR approaches and sustainability?’ ‘What contributory role does VCA play in successful and sustainable CBDRR interventions?’ ‘Under what circumstances does VCA contribute to a successful and sustainable CBDRR [intervention] and under what circumstances is it less effective?’

This research on the key determinants of a successful CBDRR programme is based on both primary and secondary data. A broad-ranging literature review provided a foundation for the study and an understanding of the wider context and debate. This was complimented by the meta-analysis of lessons learned drawn from existing RCRC CBDRR evaluations and reports. This identified 255 lessons learned that substantiated many of the issues identified in the literature review as well as highlighting additional topics; mostly relating specifically to the RCRC Movement or to the practicalities of implementing CBDRR programmes at scale. These two data sources provided a broad understanding of critical factors influencing the success of CBDRR programmes, as understood by a wide range of academics and practitioners. In addition, key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in 30 communities across Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Thailand and the Maldives as part of the fieldwork. These communities were purposively selected to be representative of the diversity across the TRP, in terms of type of community and CBDRR programme. The data from the fieldwork provided a further reference point in defining the key determinants from the perspective of the community, local branches, HNSs and other stakeholders. The four data sets were initially synthesised and analysed individually. An inductive approach to data analysis was taken whereby themes were allowed to emerge independently for each of the individual data sources. These were later synthesised and compared resulting in nine key determinants drawn from across all four data sets. Further detailed analysis of this rich data set has provided additional justification and explanation of the rationale for each key determinant. This includes identification of the contextual parameters that might determine the success of a CBDRR programme, and should therefore be assessed before deciding to undertake a CBDRR programme; also, the key activities which can be undertaken

during the programme to increase the likelihood of success. Finally, the performance of the CBDRR TRP programmes was reviewed retrospectively in the context of the key determinants in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of particular interventions and approaches. Baseline assessments were typically not completed or not available in the programmes studied; or were not directly comparable across programmes or countries. Consequently, any comparison of CBDRR programmes is subjective, nevertheless provides some useful insights.

The nine key determinants of a successful CBDRR programme identified as a result of this research are summarised in Box 2. They fall into three categories: stakeholders, programme design, programme management. Box 2: Key determinants of a successful CBDRR programme

1. The motivation and capacity of the community and community leaders

2. The motivation and capacity of the RCRC stakeholders and the strength of partnerships between them

3. The capacity of external actors (government, NGOs, private sector) and the strength of partnerships with them Programme design

4. The level of community participation and ownership of the CBDRR programme

5. The level of integration of CBDRR programmes with other sectors

6. Having an appropriate balance between standardisation and flexibility in programme design Programme management

7. Having sufficient time to implement CBDRR programmes

8. Having sufficient funding to implement CBDRR programmes

9. Having adequate assessment, monitoring and evaluation procedures

These key determinants are based on detailed analysis of a wide range of data much of which is specific to the TRP communities where CBDRR programmes had been carried out. This provides a basis for further research in other regions, and also in communities where there has not been previous DRR interventions, in order to understand the extent to which these are globally representative. TRP CBDRR programmes All TRP CBDRR programmes showed a strong awareness of the importance of stakeholder engagement and the range of stakeholders needed to be involved. A fundamental step in stakeholder engagement is the community selection process and this was most successful when undertaken in partnership with local government, when communities selected faced significant or regular hazards and understood the relevance of CBDRR programmes to their needs. Lack of CBDRR capacity within the RCRC movement (particularly the HNS) was a key challenge faced in many of the TRP CBDRR programmes, as were relationships between the large number of RCRC stakeholders involved. Capacity had many facets and included a range of issues from a shortage or high turnover of staff and volunteers, through lack of skills and experience, to a need for pre- existing manuals, guidelines or training materials, and many of these could be improved in future CBDRR programmes. The wider enabling environment created by national government, and the capacity of local government to engage in CBDRR, had a critical impact on all programmes and led to significant variation between countries. In the most successful programmes local government was involved throughout the CBDRR process and provided continuing support to communities after completion of the RCRC programme within a supportive national government context. Most TRP CBDRR programmes stated their intent to create community ownership over the programme, however this was difficult to achieve in practice. A critical activity in building ownership is the VCA process; both the way in which it is conducted and the response of the RCRC to the priorities and actions identified as a result. Increased RCRC capacity in the facilitation of the VCA process and in their ability to respond to the priorities identified in the VCA (in any sector) would significantly improve the impact of CBDRR programmes. However, the flexibility to respond to the needs of specific communities must be balanced against the requirements for standardisation, in order for the RCRC to implement CBDRR at scale. The key determinants under stakeholders and programme design are specific to CBDRR programmes, while those under programme management are more generally applicable. Many TRP CBDRR programmes faced challenges with programme management and this led to scaling back or revision of objectives in many programmes. Allocating sufficient time for the completion of CBDRR programmes and improved mechanisms for assessment, monitoring, evaluation and financial management, combined with strong programme managers would significantly improve the success of future CBDRR programmes.

Recommendations

• Develop a standardised CBDRR methodology, including community selection criteria, which can be applied at scale yet allows sufficient flexibility to respond to the needs of specific communities.

• Clearly communicate programme objectives and methodologies to all stakeholders through guidelines, tools and training.

• Increase RCRC capacity in the facilitation of the VCA process and in the ability to respond to the priorities identified in the VCA (in any sector).

• Improve staff/volunteer retention on CBDRR programmes and relationships between RCRC stakeholders.

• Involve local government throughout CBDRR programmes and advocate for the incorporation of DRR and CBDRR into national government policies

• Allocate sufficient time for the completion of CBDRR programmes and develop improved mechanisms for assessment, monitoring, evaluation and financial management of programmes

• Incorporate key determinants into standardised reporting procedures for programme implementation and into the terms of reference for external consultants undertaking evaluations of CBDRR programmes.